The Routledge Handbook of Gender and EU Politics

Edited by Gabriele Abels, Andrea Krizsán, Heather MacRae and Anna van der Vleuten

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2021
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Abels, Gabriele, 1964– editor.
Title: The Routledge handbook of gender and EU politics / edited by Gabriele Abels, Andrea Krizsán, Heather MacRae, and Anna van der Vleuten.
Description: Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge, 2021. |
Series: Routledge international handbooks |
Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2020043560 (print) | LCCN 2020043561 (ebook) |
ISBN 9781138485259 (hardback) | ISBN 9781351049955 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Women–Political activity–European Union countries. |
Feminism–European Union countries. |
Sex discrimination–European Union countries. | European Union–History.
Classification: LCC HQ1236.5.E85 R68 2021 (print) |
LCC HQ1236.5.E85 (ebook) | DDC 320.082/094–dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2020043560
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2020043561

ISBN: 978-1-138-48525-9 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-351-04995-5 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by Newgen Publishing UK

Contents

Figures

Tables

Abbreviations and acronyms

ACP	Africa, Caribbean and Pacific
ACRE	Alliance of European Conservatives and Reformists
AEMN	Alliance of European National Movements
AFCO	Committee on Constitutional Affairs, European Parliament
AfD	Alternative für Deutschland
AGRIFISH	Agriculture and Fisheries Council
AIDCO	EuropeAid Co-operation Office
ALDE	Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe
AP	action programme
APF	Alliance for Peace and Freedom
APPF	Authority for European Political Parties and European Political Foundations
AVFT	Association des victimes de harcèlement moral, psychologique, sexuel, dans le cadre du travail
BME	black and minority ethnic
CAHRV	Coordination Action on Human Rights Violations
CARD	Coordinated Annual Review on Defence
CDU	Christian Democratic Union of Germany
CEAS	Common European Asylum System
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, United Nations
CEDEFOP	European Center for the Development of Vocational Training
CEE	central and eastern Europe
CETA	Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement
CFR	Charter of Fundamental Rights
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CJEU	Court of Justice of the European Union
CoE	Council of Europe
CoFoE	Conference on the Future of Europe
COMPET	Competitiveness Council
COREPER	Comité des représentants permanents
CPCC	Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability
CPE	critical political economy

CRC	Combahee River Collective
CROME	Critical Research on Men in Europe
CSDP	Common Security and Defence Policy
CSMM	Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities
CSO	civil society organization
CSPEC	Confederation of Socialist Parties in the European Community
CSR	country-specific recommendation
DEVAW	Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women
DF	Dansk Folkeparti, Danish Peoples' Party
DG	Directorate-General
DG CLIMA	Directorate-General for Climate Action
DG DEFIS	Directorate-General for Defence Industry and Space
DG DEVCO	Directorate-General International Cooperation and Development
DG ECFIN	Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs
DG EMPL	Directorate-General Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities
DG Justice	Directorate-General Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship
DG RELEX	Directorate-General for External Relations
DG RTD	Directorate-General for Research and Innovation
DUP	Democratic Unionist Party
EAEC	European Atomic Energy Community
EASO	European Asylum Support Office
EC	European Communities
ECB	European Central Bank
ECD	European Consensus on Development
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (Council of Europe)
ECJ	European Court of Justice
ECOFIN	Economic and Financial Affairs Council
ECPM	European Christian Political Movement
ECR	European Conservatives and Reformists
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community
ECtHR	European Court of Human Rights
ECU	European Currency Unit
EDC	European Defence Community
EDF	European Development Fund
EDP	European Democratic Party
EDP	excessive deficit procedure
EEAS	European External Action Service
EEC	European Economic Community
EES	European Employment Strategy
EFA	European Free Alliance
EFDD	Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy
EFTA	European Free Trade Association

EGC	European Green Coordination
EGP	European Green Party
EIDHR	European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights
EIGE	European Institute for Gender Equality
EL	Party of the European Left
ELDR	European Liberal Democrat and Reform Party
ELSA	Ethical, Legal and Social Aspects
EMPL	Committee on Employment and Social Affairs, European Parliament
EMS	European Monetary System
EMU	Economic and Monetary Union
ENF	Europe of Nations and Freedom
ENoMW	European Network of Migrant Women
ENP	European Neighbourhood Policy
ENVI	Environment Council
EP	European Parliament
EPA	Economic Partnership Agreement
EPG	European party groups
EPLO	European Peacebuilding Liaison Office
EPO	European Protection Order
EPP	European People's Party
EPRS	European Parliamentary Research Service
EPSCO	Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council
EPSR	European Pillar of Social Rights
ERA	European Research Area
ERG	European Research Group
ERM	Exchange Rate Mechanism
ESC	Economic and Social Committee
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
ESF	European Social Fund
ESS	European Security Strategy
ESS	European Social Survey
ETF	European Training Foundation
ETS	Emissions Trading System
ETUC	European Trade Union Confederation
EU	European Union
EUCO	European Council
EUMC	European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia
EU OSHA	European Agency for Safety and Health at Work
EUPP	Euro Plus Pact
Euratom	European Atomic Energy Community
EUROFOUND	European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions

EWL	European Women's Lobby
EYCS	Education, Youth, Culture and Sport Council
FAC	Foreign Affairs Council
FEMM	Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality, European Parliament
FGM	female genital mutilation
FI	feminist institutionalism
FP	Framework Programme
FPE	feminist political economy/feminist political economist
FRA	European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights
GAC	General Affairs Council
GAD	Gender and Development
GAP	Gender Action Plan
GDP	gross domestic product
GER	gender equality regime
GFP	gender focal person
GIA	gender impact assessment
GM	gender mainstreaming
GSC	General Secretariat of the Council
GSP	Generalised System of Preferences
GUE	European United Left
HR/VP	High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy/ Vice President
IcSP	Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace
ID	Identity & Democracy Group
ILGA	International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPU-PACE	Inter-Parliamentary Union and Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe
ITC	International Trade Centre
JHA	Justice and Home Affairs Council
JRC	Joint Research Centre
LGBT	lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender
LGBTI	lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex
LGBTIQA+	lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans/transgender, intersex, queer/ questioning, and asexual
LI	liberal intergovernmentalism
LIBE	Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs, European Parliament
MENF	Movement for a Europe of Nations and Freedom
MEP	Member of the European Parliament
MP	Member of Parliament

MPCC	Military Planning and Conduct Capability
MTO	Medium-Term Objective
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NFMM	Nordic Association for Research on Men and Masculinities
NGL	Nordic Green Left
NGO	non-governmental organization
NI	new institutionalism
OLP	ordinary legislative procedure
OMC	open method of coordination
OJ	Official Journal of the European Union
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PES	Party of European Socialists
PESCO	permanent structured cooperation
PHARE	Poland and Hungary Assistance for Economic Reconstruction
PiS	Polish Law and Justice Party
PPEU	European Pirate Party
PPP	public–private partnerships
PTA	preferential trade agreement
PVV	Partij voor de Vrijheid, Dutch Freedom Party
QMV	qualified majority vote
R&D	research and development
RE	Renew Europe
RN	Rassemblement National
RRI	responsible research and innovation
RRP	radical right-wing parties
RRP	radical-right politics
RTD	research and technological development
RWP	right-wing populism
S&D	Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SEA	Single European Act
SEDE	Committee on Security and Defence, European Parliament
SGP	Stability and Growth Pact
SIA	sustainability impact assessment
SOTEU	State of the Union address
STOP	Sexual Trafficking of Persons
TCN	third-country national
TEU	Treaty on European Union
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
TRAN	Committee on Transport and Tourism, European Parliament
TSCG	Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance
TSD	trade and sustainable development
TTE	Transport, Telecommunication and Energy Council
TTIP	Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership

UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UKIP	UK Independence Party
UN	United Nations
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNSCR	United Nations Security Council Resolution
V4	Visegrád countries
VAW	violence against women
WasH	Women against sexual harassment
WAVE	Women Against Violence Europe
WEU	Western European Union
WEUCO	Women's European Council
WID	Women in Development policy
WIDE	Women in Development Europe
WPS	Women, Peace and Security
WTO	World Trade Organization

12

The European External Action Service

Laura Chappell

One of the primary innovations within the Lisbon Treaty was the creation of the European External Action Service (EEAS). The idea was to provide the EU with its own diplomatic service, ensuring coherence and efficiency in its external relations, an area that has seen rapid expansion since the creation of the Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) in 1999. Not only is the EEAS there to ensure the EU speaks with a common voice in developing and implementing foreign, security and defence policies, but also to reflect the EU's key values globally. Gender equality, considered a foundational EU norm (MacRae 2010), has been integrated into a variety of communitised policies. The question is whether the EEAS has been able to mainstream gender both internally in its own structures and externally in the external relations policies it creates, promotes and implements.

The creation of the EEAS represented a window of opportunity to fully incorporate a gender perspective into the EU's external activities. However, the structure of the EEAS has made this particularly challenging. First, the EEAS was created from the European Commission's Directorate-General for External Relations (DG RELEX), DG E in the Council as well as seconded officials from the member states. As a result, there was at least initially, a lack of a general *esprit de corps* (Davis Cross 2011; Vanhoonacker and Pomorska 2013). Second, the EEAS is partly dependent on diverse gender norms coming from the EU member states. Thus, the EEAS does not have control over its entire staff base when it comes to implementing a common culture or *esprit de corps* (see below) or mainstreaming gender with implications for gender equality policies, in the context of foreign, security and defence policies. This is particularly evident in how gender mainstreaming is viewed: is it seen purely as a tick box exercise or as a substantive and integrated part of the EEAS's activities (see Muehlenhoff in this volume)?

Considering the serious implications of a lack of gender mainstreaming both within the EEAS and the policies it promotes and implements, it is surprising that little academic work has been conducted from a gender perspective (although see Deiana and McDonagh 2018 Guerrina et al. 2018; Guerrina and Wright 2016; Haastrup 2018; Kronsell 2015, 2016; Novotnà 2015, 2016; Muehlenhoff 2017). The small body of work on gender and the EEAS has focused on the challenges in mainstreaming gender in the EEAS in respect to mediation and CSDP structures. Hence the literature identifies a lack of feminist constellations (Guerrina et al. 2018; Haastrup 2018), underscores the 'dominance of male bodies' (Kronsell 2016, 111) within CSDP

institutions and highlights the 'reproduction of gender hierarchies of the masculinized CSDP onto the feminized mediation institution' (Haastrup 2018, 232), in addition to emphasising the lack of women in various parts of the service. Nonetheless, the recently created position of the Principal Advisor on Gender and on the Implementation of UNSCR 1325 initiated in the summer 2015 and currently held by Mara Marinaki, along with her albeit small office of the gender advisor, represents an advancement in how and where gender is placed on the agenda. This in turn has raised the visibility of gender mainstreaming within the EEAS. Importantly it has facilitated the utilisation of such tools as the informal task force on women, peace and security and increased attention in respect to gender equality within EEAS staffing.

This chapter focuses on where gender can be found within EEAS structures and whether this provides a foundation for gender mainstreaming within foreign, security and defence policies (see Muehlenhoff in this volume). It is important to consider gender not only in the societies the EEAS engages with, but also that the EEAS acts as a positive example through a gender awareness in its in-house gender norms, personnel practices, training and resources. Hence, for the EU to be a normative gender actor it must embody and practice this value (see Chappell and Guerrina 2020). This chapter will underscore the challenges for the EEAS in entrenching gender into its core. This allows us to consider a variety of gaps in the research, including structural and normative impediments to mainstreaming gender, training, resource allocation, perceptions of gender and gender mainstreaming within the EEAS and the member states, and intersectionality, which in turn links to the overall agenda of diversity. These, in turn, set an overarching research agenda, which shall be elaborated upon in the final section.

Creating the EEAS: a gendered agenda?

The Treaty of Lisbon gives little detail on the structure and workings of the EEAS. Instead the service was briefly mentioned in the context of the new post of High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (HR):

> The High Representative shall be assisted by a European External Action Service. ... The organisation and functioning of the European External Action Service shall be established by a decision of the Council. The Council shall act on a proposal from the High Representative after consulting the European Parliament and after obtaining the consent of the Commission.
>
> *(Article 27(3) TEU)*

Hence, it was the task of the first HR, Catherine Ashton, to 'create' the EEAS. Thus, it took just over a year from the entering into force of the treaty in December 2009, to the formal launch of the EEAS on 1 January 2011. The EEAS's key tasks were outlined rather broadly in the Council Framework decision of 26 July 2010: supporting the HR to fulfil her duties in respect of CFSP and CSDP and in particular, 'to contribute by his/her proposals to the development of that policy ... and to ensure the consistency of the Union's external action' (2010/427/EU, 32). Additionally, EU delegations to third countries and international organisations were transferred to the EEAS from the Commission.

The EEAS's personnel came from three distinctive backgrounds located in the Commission, the Council and the member states. While the former two can be considered career EU officials who remain in the EEAS, the latter are seconded from the member states. This has implications for both gender equality and gender mainstreaming. In respect to whom these officials are, gender balance was raised as an issue early in the drafting process. The first mention of this

occurred in the 2009 Swedish Presidency report on the EEAS which outlined that recruitment should aim 'towards gender balance' (Council of the European Union 2009, 7; European Parliament 2013, 12). However, geographical balance was of greater concern to the member states and gender was not consistently part of discussions until the draft Council Decision on the EEAS in March 2010 (European Parliament 2013, 14). Rather than this element coming from the HR, it appears that it was the Green Party in the European Parliament that placed gender onto the agenda and ensured that it became a consistent central focus, along with geographical balance (European Parliament 2013; Guerrina et al. 2018, 1044).

Nonetheless, the European Parliament had little role to play following the set-up of the EEAS. Thus its gender advocacy role has not acted as a subsequent motor for gender equality as clearly highlighted by the organigram of the EEAS, and the gender distribution of member states' personnel in such directorates as the EU Military Staff and the Civilian Planning and Conduct Capability (CPCC) (see Chappell and Guerrina 2020). While the idea of gender balance was there at the foundation of the EEAS, the focus was on *adding* women into the EEAS's structures to ensure *adequate* representation. Hence the culture of the EEAS or how gender would be mainstreamed in the organisation or its policies was not part of discussions. Considering the neoliberal gender regime coming from the EU's employment agenda (see Milner in this volume) and militarised masculinity originating from the military component, which was to be part of the EEAS's competences (Chappell and Guerrina 2020; Kronsell 2016), the question remained how prominent a role gender was going to play in the EEAS itself.

Understanding the EEAS as an institutional actor: internal dynamics and institutional connections

The original focus of the EEAS concerned its construction and the development of its core business. There are three general areas of investigation: first, how the EEAS fits into the EU's overarching institutional arena; second, the internal development of the EEAS pertaining to its staffing, training and culture; third, the EEAS's tasks. In what follows we will consider these three areas in turn and link them to the nascent literature on gender and the EEAS, allowing us to identity the gaps in the current literature.

The EEAS and the Commission: partners or competitors?

The EEAS was created in a contested institutional space. Indeed, the Commission successfully managed to retain competences in foreign affairs including enlargement, the European Neighbourhood Policy, and aid highlighting issues of coherence for the EU's CFSP and broader foreign policy role. This grab for competencies set up the Commission and the EEAS as potential competitors, highlighting the idea of a 'turf war' between the two institutions (Furness 2013; Riddervold and Trondal 2017, 40). As Duke (2014, 25) highlights, the EEAS has yet to find its institutional place' and has a confusing view of its role and mission. Hence there is a gap between expectations of the EEAS and 'its ability to deliver', which Duke (2014, 43) attributes to budgets, resources and the member states and other EU institutions lack of willingness to 'give the EEAS the necessary room to develop and grow'.

A more positive view of the institutional landscape has been taken by Bátora (2013), Riddervold and Trondal (2017) and, to a lesser extent, by Shepherd (2016). Bátora states that the EEAS could become an 'innovative kind of diplomatic agency' (Bátora 2013, 610), framing it as an 'interstitial organisation' (Bátora 2013, 599), which brings together conflicting principles, practices and expectations. Thus, the EEAS's origins – combining different policy areas and

personnel – could become its strength. More recently, Riddervold and Trondal (2017, 34) consider how the EEAS 'may settle and become "normalised" into families of existing organisations'. They find that the EEAS officials act independently of the member states and that the EEAS is coordinated with the Commission, indicating 'administrative integration', which is an evolution from the earlier competitive atmosphere, contributing to a potential communitisation of CFSP (Riddervold and Trondal 2017, 40, 44). Meanwhile Shepherd highlights that the EEAS has 'the potential to enhance inter-institutional coordination and better connect CSDP with internal security' (Shepherd 2016, 96). Hence, the mainstream literature underlines the evolution of the EEAS from a competitor to a partner for the Commission. However, Shepherd (2016) also introduces the idea of stove-piping, in which tasks get 'stuck' in a particular part of the EU. This is important because the question is whether and how gender has been integrated into the EEAS.

Internal developments in the EEAS

The subsequent potential partnership between the EEAS and the Commission underscores questions relating to whether this is a partnership of equals and how gender norms have been integrated into the EEAS. The EEAS's place in the EU's institutional architecture should be taken as context for its organisation and functioning. Here the focus is on the function of the EU delegations, the background of officials, training and the idea of an *esprit de corps* (Davis Cross 2011; Henökl 2015; Juncos and Pomorska 2016 2014; Vanhoonacker and Pomorska 2013). First, the EU delegations were moved from the Commission into the EEAS and thus the focus is not on their creation but rather on their legitimacy (Maurer and Morgenstern-Pomorski 2018). Although they were largely viewed positively, they still had to 'gain legitimacy', which was done through 'adding value on the ground', although the level of success depended on 'experience of the diplomats' and 'the input of the EU ambassador' (Maurer and Morgenstern-Pomorski 2018, 311, 313). Legitimacy building proved more difficult in international organisational settings where the question remains who speaks for Europe. This raises questions concerning who these officials were, and how success was defined. On what values was success premised and how does gender fit into 'success'?

Regarding the internal creation, Missiroli (2010, 442) states that 'the strategic rationale and ultimate ambition behind the establishment of the EEAS was (and still is) the creation of a common culture and practice among EU officials and diplomats'. In line with this, Davis Cross (2011, 453) highlights that 'EEAS diplomats will naturally identify with one another, and an *esprit de corps* should be virtually automatic'. However, she also stresses that the institutional backgrounds of EEAS staff may be challenging as these may encompass 'organizational and cultural clashes' (Davis Cross 2011, 454). This latter point is taken up by Vanhoonacker and Pomorska (2013, 1316) who emphasise the 'credibility challenge' due to 'divergences in knowledge and expertise' and the fact that they are from 'different epistemic communities' (Vanhoonacker and Pomorska 2013, 1323–1324). Likewise, Henökl (2015, 679) emphasises competing institutional (intergovernmental vs. supranational) logics within the EEAS influencing officials' decision-making. In summary, developing an '*esprit de corps*', with shared beliefs, values, aims and goals, is challenging (Juncos and Pomorska 2014, 302). Despite these challenges, Henökl and Trondal (2015, 1441) confirm that EEAS officials do identify with their primary institution rather than the one they have come from. Juncos and Pomorska (2013, 1338–1340) concur, highlighting support for both the EEAS and the idea of a unified foreign policy.

Training within the EEAS could also be used to build a shared culture or an *esprit de corps* and its absence from the EEAS review was a 'lost opportunity' (Duke 2014, 42; see also Davis Cross 2011; Smith 2013, 1311). Duke (2012, 106–107) notes that that while socialisation is important,

nonetheless, knowledge and skills development should be the primary focus of any training. However, Duke (2012, 114) also notes that training could potentially become 'a primary tool for the strategic development of not only the EEAS, but the external action of the European Union itself'. Hence the development of an *esprit de corps*, while not impossible, is difficult to achieve in light of the progress in developing a common perspective concerning the running and tasks of the EEAS and the training imparted. Connecting this to gender, one area of exploration is the extent to which gender is intertwined with officials' identification with the EU and its foreign policy. This interconnects with an *esprit de corps* because, if one is to develop, it will have to integrate a gender dimension.

The question here relates to the impact such a system has had on the promotion of gender within the EEAS. Here Duke (2014, 41) underscores the personal commitment of Catherine Ashton and her role in selecting senior appointments along with Helga Schmidt's role in the professional development of women in the EEAS. Allwood (2019, 7), also points to Ashton's and her successor Federica Mogherini's commitment to 'bring about institutional cultural change'. However, barriers still remain at particular grades. Indeed, one focal point of the literature on the EEAS and gender relates to where are the women in the institution. This includes their seniority, and where within the EEAS they are located. It is important to note that while gender does not equate to women, as Haastrup (2018, 220) argues in the context of institutionalised mediation, 'the treatment of women and their situation within the EU's security institution is essential to understanding how gender works'. Women remain underrepresented at all levels with the exception of traditional women dominated positions such as assistants/secretaries (Novotnà 2015, 426). This is despite Ashton's supposed commitment as highlighted above by Duke (2014). However, the EEAS does not have responsibility for the entirety of its staff base, and more women are being recruited from the EU institutions than from the EU member states (Novotna 2015). Hence some of the responsibility for gender imbalances lies at the door of the member states.

The representation of women has improved under the second HR, Federica Mogherini, although the balance between men and women in senior positions is a long way from reaching parity. The EEAS organigram indicates that the numbers of women in senior positions fluctuates between 19% and 23% depending on the year (Chappell and Guerrina 2020; Davis 2019; European External Action Service 2017; Haastrup 2018; Novotnà 2016, 3). For EU Special Representatives or Special Envoys, just four women have been appointed to these posts out 'of 54 such posts since 1996, and two of these are currently in post' (Davis 2019, 6–7).

It is notable that, within the EEAS and the EU delegations, there are fewer women heading up ambassadorial posts in the EU's strategic partners. In EU delegations to international organisations, e.g. the UN, 'women were in charge of around 60% of these multilateral EU delegations'. Novotnà (2015, 433) suggests that these are seen as 'soft power positions, which in the eyes of some are better filled by women'. Connecting this to Maurer and Morgenstern-Pomorski's (2018) argument above, women leaders can be found where there is difficultly in building legitimacy as opposed to those scenarios where the EU's role is less likely to be questioned. This underscores the idea of women being promoted in situations of political crisis or where the organisation's role is under question.

One might furthermore expect that areas of the EEAS dealing with defence would be less gender equal than those dealing with the civilian side of CSDP. However, this is manifestly not the case (see Chappell and Guerrina 2020). It is thus important to go beyond the numbers and ask why there is a dominance of male bodies. Kronsell (2015) argues that the absence of women reflects traditional understandings of gender and what is security. She further suggests that there is a 'gendered path dependency that naturalizes the association between men, masculinity and military matters' (Kronsell 2016, 110) and includes the construction of men as

'protectors, defenders and security actors' of the 'EU homeland femininity' (Kronsell 2016, 111–114). However, the EU's military masculinity is 'civil-minded' with a focus on training rather than warfighting (Kronsell 2016, 114). Hence the way in which the EU's gender regime is constructed leads to a reproduction of gendered inequalities and integrates the civilian element of CSDP with military masculinity. Similarly, Haastrup (2018, 232) finds that because CSDP has been the focus of gender inclusivity, the gendered hierarchies within this policy area have been reproduced in the mediation structures, which has had 'unintended consequences' in the area of mediation. She also highlights the 'narrow view of women's roles', which is built on 'essentialist understandings of what women's roles in conflict ... can be' (Haastrup 2018, 228). This reification of traditional gender roles in turn impacts on how seriously gender issues are taken within the EEAS.

Meanwhile, Guerrina et al. (2018) and Guerrina and Wright (2016) underscore a lack of feminist constellations that bring together gender champions, civil society organisations and epistemic communities. Hence 'adding' women to the EEAS does not in itself lead to gender equality. Indeed, Muehlenhoff (2017, 155) underscores that 'simply adding gender equality to existing policies does not necessarily transform them unless a broad understanding of the structural causes of marginalization is included'. To ensure that a gendered agenda is successfully followed within policy-making, a feminist constellation is required. As Guerrina and Wright summarise:

> The EEAS's failure to establish itself as a champion for WPS, the absence of femocrats within the EEAS, the inability of civil society and epistemic communities to find a way to lobby the institution and promote an alternative narrative about security have all contributed to perpetuating the silence of gender in external affairs.
>
> *(Guerrina and Wright 2016, 305)*

Nonetheless Haastrup (2018, 227) points out that there are individual gender focal points who do push the agenda in respect to 'resources for gender inclusive activities' and gender mainstreaming. However, overall there is a lack of gender equality norms in the EEAS, which impacts on its ability to pursue gender sensitive policies and mainstream gender in its workings across the institution in a systematic way.

This issue is taken up by McDonagh and Deiana (2017, 3) who highlight that 'both EEAS/CSDP officials and contributing states also need to address masculine culture, complicity and male privilege' and that the idea of the EU as 'progressive' in comparison to the countries and societies they are engaging in 'evokes colonial undertones'. This emphasises the question of intersectionality within the inequalities perpetuated by the EEAS, an issue that has been overlooked in current research. This brings us back to the issue of hegemonic masculinity (see Hearn et al. in this volume) in the EEAS and the member states. Overall, the EEAS is part of the problem and fails to lead by example.

Consequently, the most important innovation regarding gender equality and mainstreaming has been the creation in 2015 of the position of Principal Advisor on Gender and on the Implementation of UNSCR 1325, an initiative of Sweden and Finland. In a statement on UNSCR 1325 shortly after being the first person to take up the post, Mara Marinaki (2015) states: 'I will work to enhance the visibility and effective prioritisation of gender and WPS in the EU's external action and to assist the work of the UN, in close consultation with all UN services and agencies'. While the feminist literature considers this a positive step, criticism remains. First, this is not a Special Representative post and thus it does not follow UN identified best practice. Second, the Gender Advisor does not report directly to the HR (see Guerrina et al. 2018;

Guerrina and Wright 2016). Finally, the office set up to support the Gender Advisor is small with just two officials, an administrator and a secretary (Chappell and Guerrina 2020; Guerrina et al. 2018; Guerrina and Wright 2016). Nonetheless this is still a recognised improvement and ensures that there is an office that priorities gender equality and mainstreaming and acts as a focal point. There are other officials within the EEAS who also have gender as part of their portfolio such as a gender and human rights advisor in the crisis management and planning directorate (CMPD)[1], a focal point on women's participation in peace processes in the Mediation Support Team, and the Advisor for Equal Opportunities and Careers, created in 2018 and is a role directly attached to the Secretary General (Chappell and Guerrina 2020; Davis 2019; Deiana and McDonagh 2018). However, for gender equality to take hold necessitates the mainstreaming of gender throughout the EEAS, which involves all officials considering the gendered impact of their work, not just those very few officials with gender in their brief. Thus, it is important to 'avoid responsibility for gender equality being assigned to a junior, often, temporary, member of staff' (Allwood 2019, 6).

This has led to several positive steps including more prioritisation of the informal task force on WPS. This has been identified as 'an opening for critical voices seeking to increase the reach of gender mainstreaming' and which has 'a nuanced understanding of the power of gender norms' (Guerrina and Wright 2016, 310). The UN is also an important means of 'providing technical expertise and advice' on UNSCR 1325 (i.e. the Security Council resolution on women and peace and security adopted in October 2000) and gender mainstreaming, and the EEAS acts as 'a willing recipient of new impetus from outside due to a lack of experience and resources', suggesting that the relationship between the UN and the EEAS regarding UNSCR 1325 is 'unique' (Joachim et al. 2017, 113–114). However, as Deiana and McDonagh (2018, 43) highlight, there is still an issue with how gender mainstreaming is understood by officials, which then travels into CSDP operations and missions only in respect to how it serves operational requirements (see Muehlenhoff in this volume). They also point to officials' understanding of gender as a 'women's issue', that 'working with women was enough' and that training on gender mainstreaming was not essential (Deiana and McDonagh 2018, 44; see also Haastrup 2018).

Considering the importance of training in underpinning an *esprit de corps*, the (mis) understanding of gender with a focus on women rather than on men and thus masculinities is problematic. Indeed, gender equality is considered something that needs to be done outside of Europe rather than inside the EEAS, as highlighted by Deaina and McDonagh (2018,46), who state: 'Interviewees ... tend to associate questions of gender equality with spaces other than Europe ... and crucially with spaces such as Afghanistan. By contrast they tend to present themselves as liberal, progressive and "not discriminators".' This is despite evidence to the contrary, in which a 'pick and mix' approach is applied to gender mainstreaming such that it is supported only if 'framed through an operational language, rather than in terms of gender equality' (Deaina and McDonagh 2018, 47). The universal applicability of WPS, both within and outside of the EU, has been underlined in the Council Conclusions 15086/18 on this particular area in 2018 along with the EU's strategic approach to WPS of the same year (see Muehlenhoff in this volume).

The EEAS as a foreign policy actor

The final area concerns the policies the EEAS pursues and how far the institution can be an autonomous actor (Furness 2013). HR Ashton, in particular, thought of the EU as a 'civilizing force' reflecting the EU's normative approach and placed emphasis on the EU neighbourhood including developing strategic partnerships (Vanhoonacker and Pomorska 2013, 1326). Again,

this connects with McDonagh and Deiana's (2017, 3) point above about 'colonial undertones', which points to a 'white saviour' narrative and underscores cultural bias.

Meanwhile Bátora (2013, 606) outlines a range of tasks given to the EEAS under external action including not just diplomacy but also 'political engagement, development assistance and civil and military crisis management', which have met with mixed success. Indeed, CSDP was sidelined under HR Ashton for example. Hence considering the importance of the civilian dimension to the EEAS role, this might imply that gender mainstreaming becomes easier than might otherwise be the case with a more defence-led agenda due its existence in communitised EU policies, while also being mindful of Shepherd's (2016) idea of stove-piping.

Looking at the principal–agent relationship between the EU member states, the Commission and the EEAS, Furness (2013) underscores the lack of EEAS autonomy in areas such as CSDP and diplomacy where it is a facilitator rather than an independent actor. Wessel and Van Vooren (2013) concur in so far as diplomatic and consular protection are concerned. They identify a tension between the EU's ambitions and international law as well as a schism between the EU and member states in areas that are intergovernmental and thus are seen to be under the latter's prerogative. Smith (2013, 1308) points to divisions between development cooperation and security policy agendas as well as between humanitarian assistance and emergency/disaster response agendas leading to a clash between the EEAS and the Commission. Furness and Gänzle (2017, 483–484) also highlight tensions regarding issues of competences between these two organisations and underscore that EEAS officials consider the institution to focus on foreign affairs and defence rather than development. They subsequently highlight the persistence of 'pillar thinking', although this was abolished in the Lisbon treaty (Furness and Gänzle 2017, 484). This is despite the fact that the HR Federica Mogherini located her office in Berlaymont, i.e. the Commission's headquarters, rather than in the EEAS building across the street at Place Schuman, following a request from Commission President Juncker (Furness and Gänzle 2017, 482; Henökl 2015, 679–680). Of key concern is the EU's lack of strategy which impinges on the EEAS's ability to set priorities 'because they will not have a strong sense of the organization's interests beyond maximizing its own bureaucratic responsibilities' (Furness 2013, 124; see also Furness and Gänzle 2017, 481). However, the question is where gender appears in any such strategy, particularly in respect to the 2016 EU Global Strategy (see Muehlenhoff in this volume).

Linking this to a normative gender dimension, raises questions concerning the EEAS's ability to promote EU norms in the context of EU member states' conflicting opinions on the role of the EEAS that circumscribes its action. Moreover, the EEAS and certain EU member states are still equating gender with women and the rationale for including women relates to the effectiveness in implementing tasks rather than seeing gender equality as a fundamental norm to be implemented because it is right to do so (Bratosin D'Almeida et al. 2017; Guerrina and Wright 2016, 307). Hence, men are the 'norm' and naturally associated with the EEAS and its tasks, while women are 'other'. Bratosin D'Almeida, Haffner and Hörst (2017, 317) underscore that when women take up positions, particularly in conflict environments or in male-dominated areas such as the police, their competence to do the job can be questioned by their male colleagues and that 'women from civilian backgrounds faced even greater prejudice'. It is here that the visibility of the Gender Advisor in visiting missions and operations is particularly important in advancing work on gender (Bratosin D'Almeida et al. 2017, 320). Additionally, as the personnel come from the member states, challenging gendered structures of power requires the EEAS and member states to work together, something which is rather difficult considering the difference in gender norms between the member states. Finally, Allwood (2019, 12, 14) points to the absence of gender when development (see Debusscher in this volume) intersects with other external policy areas such as migration and climate change, where the 'discourse of crisis' is attached. This

indicates that other agendas take over, and thus gender gets lost, as it is not prioritised, rather than getting stuck in one part of the EU's institutional structure, as stove-piping would suggest.

Researching gender and the EEAS: a call to action

Considering the debates outlined, the focus of this section is to highlight a range of different areas where a gender lens could be applied to create new understandings of the EEAS as an institution, to underscore how structures of power can be challenged and changed thus connecting to the emancipatory project of feminist research. This chapter has demonstrated that there is a developing literature that explores gender within the EEAS, an area that the mainstream literature fails to engage with in any meaningful way. However, significant research gaps remain when exploring the EEAS's lack of success in closing the gender gaps despite its seeming commitment to do so. This raises several areas for further research. The first is how the EEAS and the individual member states define gender, gender equality and gender mainstreaming. For some member states, gender simply equates to women and girls, leading to a particular understanding of gender equality and mainstreaming (for gender regimes see von Wahl in this volume). Considering that one third of officials come from the member states it is imperative that a closer examination is provided on this issue.

Second, research on human resources is required, particularly on what work the EEAS is doing to improve internal gender equality. The Secretary General created two task forces on equal opportunities and careers resulting in one report each with recommendations in 2017. Subsequently an implementation roadmap was put together. These policies need fully assessing along with recent structural changes to the EEAS as underlined in the recent organigram released in 2019. Bacchi's (1999) 'what is the problem represented to be' approach acts as a relevant starting point. This leads to particular solutions depending on how this is framed. Is it women whom are responsible for their own empowerment as per neoliberal rationality (see Muehlenhoff 2017)? Why is there a focus on gender equality? Is it because this is a key EU norm or, because of reasons related to the EEAS's functionality, i.e. that more diverse teams make better teams? Indeed, there is little explicit research on intersectionality in the context of the EEAS. The only characteristic taken into account in hiring processes is gender and this may have led to a focus on gender without the necessary thought being given to LGBTQI+, race, religion, age or class for example and how these structural power inequalities interact with gender (see Solanke in this volume). Hence it is not just about 'adding' people from diverse backgrounds to create a better functioning EEAS, but to consider what are the barriers to preventing people from these backgrounds to consider the EEAS as a place to work. How is the EEAS constructed as a workplace and what training is being done to facilitate equality and diversity? Although there is some understanding that family-friendly policies are needed, the 'problem' appears to be placed on women not applying, particularly from the member states, rather than looking at the gendered structures and tasks in the EEAS which may perpetuate inequality and gender stereotyping.

Third, the civilian areas of the EEAS need to be further explored institutionally, particularly regarding gender regimes. This is important considering that the human rights, global and multilateral issues directorate, which includes civilian areas such as development, migration and human security, has not been a central feature of feminist research (although see Allwood (2019) regarding development policy; see Debusscher in this volume). Additionally, considering that human rights and gender are often subsumed together in the security and defence areas of the EEAS, it is critical to understand how gender is integrated in this directorate. Is this different to the military and, if so, how? Moreover, what roles are women and men expected to play and how

gendered are these? As has been highlighted in the military domain, increasing the number of women in military operations is seen to be 'good' not because it is a norm but because it makes these operations more effective (see Guerrina and Wright 2016; Muehlenhoff 2017). This leads to a neoliberal understanding of gender equality in which gender needs to be useful in order to be engaged with. Hence women are not the 'norm' in the masculinised institution of the EEAS and the activities it performs. They are thus reduced to a resource to be fitted into the EEAS as a security institution rather than the EEAS being transformed into a gender-sensitive body which puts gender equality at the forefront of its developing *esprit de corps*.

Conclusion

In summary, the puzzle at the centre of this chapter is how the EU can, on the one hand, purport to have gender equality as part of its DNA (European External Action Service 2015), while, on the other hand, have significant difficulties in promoting and achieving gender equality within the EEAS. Building on feminist institutionalist (see MacRae and Weiner in this volume) and gender regime literature, feminist scholarship has started to interrogate the hegemonic masculinities inherent in the EEAS. While the mainstream literature has underscored the idea of building an *esprit de corps* and highlighting issues of coherence within the EU's foreign and security policy architecture, there is no consideration regarding how gender norms would enter such an *esprit de corps* or how they would travel from the Commission to the EEAS.

Starting with Enloe's (1990) 'where are the women' this chapter highlighted the lack of women within the EEAS's senior leadership team, proliferation of male bodies in the militarised components of the EEAS and how militarised masculinity has travelled to the civilian dimension (Haastrup 2018; Kronsell 2016). Work by Guerrina et al. (2018) and Guerrina and Wright (2016) has also underscored the lack of feminist constellations as a block to gender equality. Clearly the implementation of gender equality throughout the EEAS in Brussels and in the EU delegations would lead to a more gender-sensitive approach in EU officials' engagements in the field and a deeper understanding of the gender agenda rather than it being seen as an 'add on' to existing more important security activities. The application of feminist lenses to the EEAS as an institution, how it is structured, the location of gender and its relative importance is essential to a policy area which has traditionally been seen to be 'gender neutral'.

Note

1. The EEAS has been re-structured and the CMPD no longer exists. Instead security and defence activities are located inter alia within the following departments: Integrated Approach for Security and Peace, and Security and Defence Policy.

References

Allwood, G (2019): Gender equality in European Union development policy in times of crisis, *Political Studies Review*, Special Issue, 1–17, URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/1478929919863224.

Bacchi C (1999): *Women, Policy and Politics: The Construction of Policy Problems*, London: Sage.

Bátora J (2013): The 'Mitrailleuse effect'. The EEAS as an interstitial organization and the dynamics of innovation in diplomacy, *Journal of Common Market Studies* **51** (4), 598–613.

Bratosin D'Almeida I, Haffner R, Hörst C (2017): Women in the CSDP: strengthening the EU's effectiveness as an international player, *European View* **16** (2), 313–324.

Chappell, L and Guerrina R (2020): Understanding the gender regime in the European External Action Service, *Cooperation and Conflict*, 1–20, URL: https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836719895296.

Council of the European Union (2009): *Presidency report to the European Council on the European External Action Service*, 14930/09, Brussels: Council of the European Union.

Davis, L (2019): Civil Society Dialogue Network Background Paper EU Support to Women Mediators: Moving Beyond Stereotypes, EPLO Working Paper, URL: http://eplo.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/EPLO_CSDN_Background-Paper_EU-Support-to-Women-Mediators.pdf (download: 4 April 2020).

Davis Cross M (2011): Building a European diplomacy. Recruitment and training to the EEAS, *European Foreign Affairs Review* **16** (4), 447–464.

Deiana M, McDonagh K (2018): 'It is important, but …': Translating the Women Peace and Security (WPS) agenda into the planning of EU peacekeeping missions, *Peacebuilding* **6** (1), 34–48.

Duke S (2012): Diplomatic training and the challenges facing the EEAS, *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* **7** (1), 95–114.

Duke S (2014): Reflections on the EEAS Review, *European Foreign Affairs Review* **19** (1), 23–44.

Enloe C (1990): *Bananas, Beaches and Bases*, Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

European External Action Service (2015): 'Statement by First Vice-President Timmermans, High-Representative/Vice-President Mogherini and Commissioners Mimica, Avramopoulos, Thyssen, Stylianides and Jourová on the Occasion of International Women's Day', 8 March 2015, URL: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_STATEMENT-15-4573_en.htm (download 20 August 2019).

European External Action Service (EEAS) (2017), *Organisation Chart*. 1 June

European Parliament (2013): *Achieving Geographical and Gender Balance in the European External Action Service*, EXPO/B/AFET/2012/02, URL: www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2013/457106/EXPO-JOIN_ET(2013)457106_EN.pdf (download 20 August 2019).

Furness M (2013): Who Controls the European External Action Service? Agent Autonomy in EU External Policy, *European Foreign Affairs Review* **18** (1), 103–126.

Furness M, Gänzle S (2017): The security–development nexus in European Union foreign relations after Lisbon: policy coherence at last?, *Development Policy Review* **35** (4), 475–492.

Guerrina R, Chappell L, Wright KAM (2018): Transforming CSDP? Feminist triangles and gender regimes, *Journal of Common Market Studies* **56** (5), 1036–1052.

Guerrina R, Wright KAM (2016): Gendering normative power Europe: Lessons of the women, peace and security agenda, *International Affairs* **92** (2), 293–312.

Haastrup T (2018): Creating Cinderella? The unintended consequences of the women peace and security agenda for EU's mediation architecture, *International Negotiation* **23** (2), 218–237.

Henökl TE (2015): How do EU foreign policy-makers decide? Institutional orientations within the European External Action Service, *West European Politics* **38** (3), 679–708.

Henökl TE, Trondal J (2015): Unveiling the anatomy of autonomy. Dissecting actor-level independence in the European External Action Service, *Journal of European Public Policy* **22** (10), 1426–1447.

Joachim, J, Schneiker, A and Jenichen, A (2017): External networks and institutional idiosyncrasies. The Common Security and Defence Policy and UNSCR 1325 on women, peace and security, *Cambridge Review of Internaitonal Affairs*, **30** (1), 105–124.

Juncos AE, Pomorska K (2013): 'In the face of adversity'. Explaining the attitudes of EEAS officials vis-à-vis the new service, *Journal of European Public Policy* **20** (9), 1332–1349.

Juncos AE, Pomorska K (2014): Manufacturing esprit de corps: the case of the European External Action Service, *Journal of Common Market Studies* **52** (2), 302–319.

Kronsell A (2015): Sexed bodies and military masculinities. Gender path dependence in EU's Common Security and Defense Policy, *Men and Masculinities* **19** (3), 1–26.

Kronsell A (2016): The power of EU masculinities. A feminist contribution to European integration theory, *Journal of Common Market Studies* **54** (1), 104–120.

Marinaki M (2015): 15th anniversary and Global Review of UNSCR 1325, 13 November 2015, URL: https://eeas.europa.eu/headquarters/headquarters-homepage/5846/node/5846_ro (download 20 August 2019).

McDonagh K, Deiana M (2017): Add Women and Hope? Assessing the Gender Impact of the EU Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) Missions, Policy Report, Dublin: Dublin City University.

Novotnà T (2015): Women in the EEAS and EU Delegations: Another Post-Westphalia Change?, in: Spence D, Batora J (eds.): *The European External Action Service European Diplomacy Post-Westphalia*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 392–402.

Novotnà T (2016): Not a leap but a step in the right direction. Mogherini's structural and personnel reform of the EU's diplomatic service, *Europeum Monitor*, March.

MacRae H (2010): The EU as a gender equal polity: myths and realities, *Journal of Common Market Studies* **48** (1), 155–174.

Maurer H, Morgenstern-Pomorski JH (2018): The quest for throughput legitimacy. The EEAS, EU delegations and the contest structures of European diplomacy, *Global Affairs* **4** (2–3), 305–316.

Missiroli A (2010): *The EU 'Foreign Service': Under Construction*, RSCAS Policy Papers 2010/04, Florence: European University Institute.

Muehlenhoff H (2017):Victims, soldiers, peacemakers and caretakers: the neoliberal constitution of women in the EU's security policy, *International Feminist Journal of Politics* **19** (2), 153–167.

Riddervold M, Trondal J (2017): Integrating nascent organisations. On the settlement of the European External Action Service, *Journal of European Integration* **39** (1), 33–47.

Shepherd AJK (2016): CSDP and the Internal–External Security Nexus, in: Chappell L, Mawdsley J, Petrov P (eds.): *The EU, Strategy and Security Policy. Regional and strategic challenges*, Abingdon: Routledge, 87–103.

Smith ME (2013): The European External Action Service and the security–development nexus. Organizing for effectiveness of incoherence, *Journal of European Public Policy* **20** (9), 1299–1315.

Vanhoonacker S, Pomorska K (2013): The European External Action Service and agenda-setting in European foreign policy, *Journal of European Public Policy* **20** (9), 1316–1331.

Wessel R, Van Vooren B (2013): The EEAS's diplomatic dreams and the reality of European and international law, *Journal of European Public Policy* **20** (9), 1350–1367.